

A
R E V I E W
OF THE
LETTER ON ROYAL FASTS,

ADDRESSED TO AN

ANTIBURGER,

Wall:

Mitchell

Which appeared in

The CALEDONIAN MERCURY,

MARCH 28th last.

Signed a LOYALIST.

1770 —

Non quis, sed quid?

Inventus, Chrysispe, tui finitor acervi.

PER.

He who his Prince too *blindly* does obey,
To keep his faith,—his *virtue* throws away.

DRY.

EDINBURGH:

PRINTED BY D. PATERSON,

FOR R. INGLIS Bookseller, Potterrow.

And sold by him, and by W. GRAY, Bookseller Exchange.

M DCC LXXVIII.

1608/3410.

REVUE

OF THE
LETTER ROYAL FATS



TO AN

ANTIBURCHER

Which appeared in

THE CALLEDONIAN MERCURY

March 18th 1865

Signed a LOYALIST.

Antiburche

Antiburche, the Antichrist

Part

He who his Prince too little does obey

To keep his name - his spirit knows away

Part

EDMUND BURCH

Printed by D. Patterson

For R. Innes Hoockler, Patterson

And sold by him, and by W. Gray, Hoockler & Co.

M DCC LXXVII

LOYALIST'S LETTER REVIEWED.

THE letter relative to fairs appointed by civil authority which we intend here to call under review, was published in the *Caledonian Mercury* on the 28th of March, signed a LOYALIST. We designed at first to make a reply to that letter through the same channel; but it was soon found that a corner in a news-paper would be insufficient for displaying its worth.

Loyalist's manner bespeaks him to be vehemently incensed against those who did not attend upon public worship, on the fast-day lately appointed by civil authority. And, seeing he deemed their conduct, on that occasion, to be wrong,—it was doubtless kind in him to become their instructor,—to “remind them of their duty (as he professes) with the gentle and persuasive arguments of duty, interest and gratitude.” But in place of entertaining them with *persuasive* arguments to convince them that a different conduct would have been their duty; why has he served them with nothing but *discordant* declamation?

His reason sleeps; his frantic fancy wakes,
Supplies her place,—and wild ideas takes,
From words and things ill-sorted and misjoined,
The anarchy of thought, and chaos of the mind.

His verbal artillery (which they cannot, in return to his compliment, acknowledge to be “dreadful,”) is particularly directed against the obnoxious *Antiburghers* *: He boasts of the great execution which, as he imagines, he

* His animosity vent itself particularly against a certain individual, “whose distinguished zeal and faithfulness,” (to use the words of one who had occasion to consider such treatment of him formerly) “seconded by singular abilities, has procured him abundance of enemies, and made him obnoxious to much unmerited reproach; and the thrust has been often aimed at the interests of religion through his sides.”

he has thereby done. As distressed by him they have
 “involved themselves in *difficulties* out of which (he modestly notifies) I am bold to say” they “have not *abilities* to extricate themselves!”

What Loyalist so eagerly labours to fix upon the “wild” Antiburghers is a *romantic* charge of *disloyalty* or disaffection to his majesty, and the British constitution. How shall the heavy charge be repelled? May they appeal to their public acts, wherein their principles on this subject are fully displayed? Among these there is an act of the Associate Presbytery, (of the date of February 1743,) in which “they did, and hereby do, assert and declare; that we *ought* to *acknowledge* the *present* civil authority over these nations, and *subjection* thereto in *lawful* commands.” But, such is Loyalist’s penetration, he will not admit of this as any exculpation. Having with admirable *sagacity* found out that the *Antiburghers* are not now the Associate Synod,—are not *Seceders*, except from the said Synod; and having *appropriated* this character to those who, he says, are now best known by the name of Burghers†: He belabours them for their *dulness* in presuming to make the appeal. “You ought not, says Loyalist, to have quoted the instances of *their* loyalty, as proofs of *yours*. That the *Seceders* were loyal at the period you alluded to, (*viz.* 1745.) and are so even now, I never disputed.”

Here he allows, as an undisputed fact; that *Seceders* were *then* dutiful subjects,—that they gave indisputable instances of their loyalty, at that period. If the Antiburghers still retain and publicly profess those very same principles, which the Associate Synod, and all in connexion with it,—then did; why now dispute their loyalty? That they retain the same principles still, they constantly aver. Nay, says Loyalist; and his proof, such as it is, he has ready at hand. The quotations from the Display of the Secession-testimony, “are,” what

† Such as would wish to know the real state of these matters, may consult the *Display of the Secession-Testimony*, vol. II. where the subject is fully discussed.



are they? they are, he affirms, "only instances of *their* "loyalty,"—(*i. e.* Burgher-loyalty) "not proofs of *yours*." Very fine! And is this one of the difficulties he has overwhelmed them in, "out of which, he is bold to say, "they have not *abilities* to extricate themselves?" How do the matters mentioned in the quotation *ascertain*, by his own concession,—the *loyalty* of the Associate Synod formerly, and that of the *Burghers* still? Is it not from this, that the Associate Synod openly acknowledged these principles before the world as *theirs*; and from a supposition that the *Burghers* still retain them, and *practise* accordingly? And do not the Antiburghers the same? Yes: they as publicly and solemnly avow their adherence to these principles, as ever the Associate Presbytery, or Synod did,—either before, at, or after the period, unto which, above, a reference was made. Why not then quote and sustain them, "as proofs of *their* loyalty?" "Only instances of Burgher-loyalty!" Strange! Is the supposition rational? Can it meet with credence, "that "a (so called) *Antiburgher*," would be so prodigal of his time as to spend it in collecting, arranging and illustrating (not to mention his risking the expence of publishing) principles not *his own*, not of his *own* communion,—but of a communion so *abhorrent* to it, as that of the Burghers? Can such a "wild fancy" exist any where, to use his own amiable dialect, but in a *Loyalist's* "disordered imagination?"

If the Antiburghers appeal to their uniform practice during the *Jacobitish* rebellion in 1745, and ever since,—as an evidence that they have acted in full agreement with their principles; shall they be heard? Loyalist seems resolutely determined to admit of no plea whatever in their behalf. "That not ONE of the Seceders from the "established church were found to join in the then rebel cause," says he, "I readily allow; but there is a difference between Seceders *then*, and *Antiburghers* now." Pray, Good Mr. Loyalist, particularize any *one* difference, in point, if you can. There is no reason why your simple affirmation should be sustained, in evidence of such invidious crimination. Some, who *then* belonged

ed

ed to the Secession, are still alive, and have been all along in connection with these, who, it would seem, *torment such dwellers on the earth as you*. Mention the time and place of their manifesting any difference, either in principle or conduct, with regard to the point of loyalty,—since that period. Until this be done, may they not justly view your assertion, in the light of an *unfounded* imputation? If Loyalist's rancour would permit him to give ear,—they could *scribe* themselves, and inform him that they are *presently* as firmly attached to his majesty's person, to the British constitution, and to the Protestant succession, as any of their fellow subjects are. And don't it ill become *him*, whatever others may do, to treat them as *BANKRUPTS*, whose *credit* is gone?

Whoever may afterwards judge it to be for their *interest* to renew the charge of *disloyalty* against the Antiburghers, Loyalist, methinks, can never, with self-consistence attempt it. Has he not materially absolved them of all such criminality, on the ground of their not observing, what he calls, *Royal-Fasts*? He has in terms "allowed, that *Seceders* were *loyal* at the period" above alluded to; and that they are so even now. Seceders however, at the time referred to, *kept no such fasts*; as is abundantly evident from their principles on this subject, —*then* published, and, in a little to be here adduced. Don't it hence follow, that *Antiburghers* are allowed to be dutiful and *loyal* subjects? This Loyalist must yield, unless unrelenting animosity against them, should rouse him to sign a palinody;—or influence him to maintain that what is harmless in the conduct of one person, is highly criminal in the conduct of another; though, their circumstances, so far as they respect that wherein the comparison is stated,—be perfectly similar. And, who but those of "narrow and confined ideas," would hesitate, for the sake of promoting a favourite purpose;—to call evil good, and good evil;—to put *darkness* for *light*, and *light* for *darkness*?

The loyalty of those who are distinguished by the name of *Burghers*, is highly celebrated by Loyalist; and that

that they are so, is readily admitted, though not for the reason which he assigns. "They have acted," says this faithful historian "consistently with the principles upon which they at first set out; and did, upon the late fast as well as former royal fasts,—act as loyal subjects and good Christians." How proper a test, their acting in this manner, may be,—of *such Christianity* as a loyalist is acquainted with; it is certainly fit, that he himself should be allowed to determine. But whether they have "acted consistently," in regard to this point, "with the principles upon which they at first set out,—let these principles bear witness." He is very positive that the title of the Associate Synod did originally, and does still, belong to the Burghers; and has himself sustained its acts in evidence of their loyalty. And why not also admit and sustain them for determining whether they have acted so very consistently as is pretended?

The principle respecting this subject, with which they at first set out,—and a principle which is held by Anti-burghers still; may be seen in an act of the Associate Presbytery at *Dunfermline*, January 8th 1741. In this act the church's giving up, and the civil magistrate's assuming the power of appointing fasts in ordinary cases,—and the presbytery's partial symbolizing therewith, in the preceding year; are specified as grounds of humiliation. But in regard this act is out of print, and but rarely to be met with; it may not be amiss to transcribe that part of it, which relates to this subject.

"Which day and place the Associate Presbytery being met, and taking under their serious consideration,—the many just causes of the Lord's anger and controversy gone forth against us, &c. And whereas the commission of the last assembly have given up to the civil magistrate the power belonging to the church of Christ to appoint days of fasting and humiliation, and to name the day; and the civil magistrate has assumed that power, unlawfully resigned to him by the church,—by appointing a fast in consequence of the commission's application, to be observed in Scotland the fourth day of February next; And though the presbytery

“ bytary observed a fast last year, on the same day appointed for that end, by the magistrate; after declaring they could not observe the said day, upon his authority in the proclamation for that effect,—but for the reasons mentioned in the act appointing the same day :”

“ Yet however plausible these reasons at that time appeared unto us; we cannot now but apprehend, upon *more mature* consideration, and desire to own and acknowledge,—that upon a mistake, we ourselves *went too far* in symbolizing with the above unwarrantable practice, of the church’s giving up, and the magistrate’s assuming the power of naming the day,—by observing the same day appointed by the civil magistrate;—and we desire through grace to ly low in the dust before the Lord;—saying, What we see not, teach thou us; and if we have done iniquity we will do so no more: And though it was controverted last year that the intrinsic power was given up and assumed; in regard there were so few days between the meeting of the commission, and the date of the proclamation;—yet now that the commission have repeated their deed of a formal and voluntary giving up to the civil magistrate the *intrinsic power* of the church, by applying to the king for naming the day for fasting and humiliation,—and that he hath appointed the day accordingly; it appears that there is a sinful combination between church and state,—to make an invasion upon the *headship* and *sovereignty* of our Lord Jesus Christ over his church, as his free and independent kingdom: And we cannot but look upon it, as a cause of humiliation before the Lord,—that such manifest dishonour hath been done unto him, whom God hath appointed King in *his holy hill of Zion*: The Lord our God is a jealous God,—he is jealous of his worship and honour, *and will not give his glory to another.*”

“ And though it is the great duty of all ranks to humble themselves before the Lord, and of each to stir up one another to the exercise,—and particularly
“ for

“ for the civil magistrate to excite those under him to
 “ this duty; yet it is the duty of the *office-bearers* in
 “ the Lord’s house *to search out and discover* the causes
 “ of the Lord’s contending with a church and land,—
 “ and to *set apart* times of *solemn humiliation* before the
 “ Lord on account of these, and even to say to *kings*
 “ *and queens, humble yourselves* : So when a church does
 “ deliver up to the powers of the earth, that trust and
 “ right which the Lord hath lodged in their hand; and
 “ when the civil magistrate adventures either to deprive
 “ the church of her right, or (to) accept of and exercise
 “ that trust and power,—which she hath thus sinfully
 “ alienated;—it is a *consenting* to the alienation; and so
 “ incurring the *guilt*, in conjunction with the church,—
 “ of *dethroning the Prince of the kings of the earth, the King*
 “ *of kings, and the Lord of lords.*”

“ For which, and other weighty causes,—the presby-
 “ tery beseech, call and obtest all under their inspec-
 “ tion; to humble themselves before the Lord,—to
 “ supplicate the throne of grace that God would avert
 “ deserved wrath;—that he may be gracious to our Sc-
 “ vereign King George, may give success to his arms a-
 “ gainst the enemies of the peace and welfare of these
 “ lands; that he may excite and determine all ranks to
 “ return unto the Lord our God, and make his Zion a
 “ peaceful habitation, a praise in all the earth.”

Some years afterwards, (being the period in which
 Loyalist allows the Seceders to have been abundantly
loyal) the Associate Presbytery expressed the principles
 which they then held in the following words: “ Though
 “ it be unwarrantable for the civil magistrate, in ordi-
 “ nary cases, and where there is, and where access may
 “ be had to the judicatories of a right constitute church,
 “ or that he sustains as such, to appoint *fasts* and *thanksgivings*
 “ simply by his own power; yet not only was
 “ the intrinsic power of the church despised, some time
 “ after the Revolution, in the appointment of several
 “ fasts and thanksgivings merely by civil authority: But
 “ of late years, while the judicatories have practically
 “ surrendered this intrinsic power to the magistrate; he

" hath also practically assumed and exercised the same,
 " in appointing fasts merely by his own authority: For,
 " whatever was his design,—yet this was plainly the de-
 " sign of his appointments; in regard the judicatories
 " accepted the same, as answers to their petitions for
 " nominating the day,—and he hath never discouraged
 " them in their said surrender and acceptance: Against
 " all which this presbytery maintains a stated testimony;
 " though they have not reckoned it necessary to apply
 " the same, on repeated occasions, otherwise than by
 " their *practice* *".

Such were the principles held, as to this point, by all
 Seceders,—before the unhappy breach in the Associate
 Synod,—occasioned by the controversy concerning the
 lawfulness of swearing the burghs-oath among them;
 for to those in communion with the established church
 the controversy had no respect. And the *conduct* of
 those since, who were then so resolute in behalf of its law-
 fulness has in this, as well as in other matters, been a *prac-*
tical acknowledgment that the oath in which Loyalist
 says, " they saw nothing improper," was found by them
 to be *inconsistent* with the principles upon which they
 at first set out. Loyalist allows that the burghs-oath,
 " was, and still is, considered as a bulwark to the church
 " of Scotland:" But how it can be a bulwark to her,
 but on supposition, that every one who swears it,—so-
 lemnly rehounces all other communions, and as so-
 lemnly engages in communion with her; let any " man
 " of common sense" declare. And if so, how could it
 then, how can it *now* be a " wild fancy" to reckon it in-
 consistent for a person who is in a state of secession from
 the established church, because of her manifold errors
 in doctrine, and corruptions in administration,—to swear
 an oath of communion with her; while, in the mean
 time, he is in secession therefrom, and resolves to con-
 tinue so,—until she remember from whence she is fallen, and
 repent, and do the first works?

Why

* See the Associate Presbytery's Answers to Mr. Nairn's *Reasons of Dis-*
sent, first published in the year 1744. These answers may be found in the
Display of the Secession testimony, Vol. I.

Why don't the *clerical* gentlemen of that communion act candidly, and inform their people, inform the world, that they have *renounced* the principles upon which they at first set out? It is not unknown that a number of their people have been hitherto shagrin'd at their conduct with respect to royal fasts; nor are the various *artifices*, which they have fallen upon to soothe them,—altogether hid. The better to conceal the deceit, perhaps, a sessional or presbyterial fast is pretended to be kept on the same day. What would you think of circulating a *simisy* manuscript to satisfy the scrupulous; but cautiously left a *blank*, where the matter particularly denied in point of fact should have been documented? Or what, though a secret, in place of argument,—should be *whispered* from the pulpit? And why not tantalize them with expectations of a new testimony, from which *old things* shall be expelled; and in their place *new things* inscribed with such accuracy and perspicuity,—as shall banish all scrupulosity? How much to be pitied are the people whose *leaders*, by their instruction and example,—have not only caused them to err from the principles which they at first espoused; but also strain every nerve to prevent their returning unto them? Hark, ye priests, who have been, and still are a *snare on Mizpah*, and a *net spread upon Tabor*; your light either formerly or presently must be darkness; and if the light, that is in you, be darkness,—how great is that darkness! If it be not darkness; for your own credit, and the good of others, cause it to shine forth. At any rate, ye are involved in the guilt of inconstitence, self-contradiction, and, may it not be added, *perjury* in the matter of witness-bearing. If any man build what he once destroyed, and destroy what he formerly built,—he makes himself a transgressor. Every *apostate* is self-condemned;—he *that is such is subverted*, and *sinneeth*, being condemned of himself. Be wise, ye people,—bethink yourselves and retreat in time; lest the retrograde motion of your clerical leaders be accelerated, and, ere you be aware, engulf you in the turbid ocean of establishment.

Hitherto, for involving the Antiburghers in inextricable

cable difficulties, Loyalist hath not come within view of the point to be proved, viz. "That we ought to keep "royal fasts:" but now he will approach nearer, and establish it by conclusive arguments. With this design how accurately does he observe, that "if disobedience to "lawful authority constitute criminality, your conduct "can scarcely be viewed in any other light!" Is there not here a strong tincture of that famous *loyalism* which the Scotch curates were once such sticklers for, and whose "conduct" on that account, he professes to "*hate*?" Is Loyalist yet to learn that there may be commands of lawful authority,—disobedience to which *cannot* constitute criminality? If so,—he may peruse for his *correction and instruction in righteousness*, the VI. chap. of *Daniel's* prophecy. It is now a long time since *his* predecessor's in crimination, being *moved with envy*, and assisted with *certain lewd fellows of the baser sort*; accused a harmless kind of people of disobedience to the commands of a lawful Sovereign, crying, *These that have turned the world upside down, are come hither also.—These all do contrary to the decrees of lawful authority, saying, there is another king than Cæsar, one JESUS.* Loyalist professes to "injoin obedience "to the *lawful* commands of a rightful sovereign." That his Majesty King GEORGE is our rightful sovereign is cheerfully allowed; and who, but a bedlamite will deny that the lawful commands of a rightful sovereign are to be obeyed: But to insinuate that the appointment of *fasts*, in the circumstances above defined by the Associate Presbytery, is comprehended in the class of *lawful* commands,—is a pitiful *begging* of what should have been established, by "the persuasive arguments of duty."—Such is the amount of all in his letter, that has any thing of the appearance of reasoning, in support of his opinion!

Loyalist next betakes himself to authorities for bearing up his tottering fabric,—and informs his readers, lest, perchance, they should be so purblind as not to perceive it,—that "they *might* be allowed to be conclusive." He properly enough appeals to the *Bible* in the first place; and if he spent more time in the perusal of that volume,

volume,—would he not be much better employed than he frequently is? The three passages which he quotes are, 1 Pet. ii. 13. *Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king, as supreme, &c.* Rom. xiii. 1. *Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.* Tit. iii. 1. *Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates.* A quotation, however, from *Chevy-Chace* would have been equally conclusive: For though these texts clearly “injoin obedience” to the *lawful* commands of a rightful sovereign; yet they don't give the *remotest* hint, whether the commands in question be lawful or unlawful.—This must be determined from other texts than those that simply injoin obedience.—These texts have indeed been often pressed into the service of the *once renowned* principle of passive obedience and non-resistance; a principle as repugnant to the constitution and genuine spirit of the *British* government, as it is to the dictates of common sense. If Loyalist means to flourish away in behalf of this principle, he may give a commission to his *intellectual purveyors*; and having plentifully *inspired* their *mental effluvia*, he may *stream* it forth, wherever he shall be permitted,—and why not as formerly, in the P—th—n?

Loyalist brings his second authority from the Confession of Faith, chap. xx. §. 4. and xxiii. §. 3. 4. “These passages are so obvious, says he, in favour of my opinion that you *ought* to keep loyal fasts; that they might with justice be allowed to be conclusive.” And who would hesitate a moment to allow his being fully qualified to bless the world with an account of their obvious appearance, when “viewed with a jaundiced eye.” It is, however, obvious to others, that these passages are so far from being in favour of such an opinion, that they judge it to be therein particularly *discarded*. “The civil magistrate (it is therein a statute) may not assume to himself—the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” chap. xxiii. §. 3. If Loyalist means to avail himself of the Confession of Faith, for involving the Antiburghers in difficulties more than *imaginary*: It behoves

moves him to shew from the passages he has quoted, or any others he may please to call in to his aid,—that the appointment of fasts, at first instance, in ordinary cases, by the civil magistrate,—is neither an *assumption*, nor *exercise* of the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven. All that he can advance on the subject, *short* of this, is so obviously *to darken counsel by words without knowledge*; that the Antiburghers may not be so *unjust* as to allow it to be conclusive.

That these passages which Loyalist imagines to be so obviously in his favour, were not so understood *from the beginning*; appears from the *practice* of both church and state, at that period,—wherein the Confession of Faith was received and ratified. “The commission of the general assembly, Oct. 6th, 1648. appointed a solemn humiliation and fast to be kept on the 14th day of December following” for the causes mentioned in their act: And the committee of estates upon the 14th day of October, in the same year, “did heartily approve their seasonable resolution; and required and ordained that the fast and humiliation *appointed* by the commission of the General Assembly be religiously observed.” How exactly did they exemplify, in their respective acts the principle which Antiburghers still maintain; and for which, a *Loyalist now wishes* to hold them up as objects of derision!

Loyalist has what he proclaims an insuperable authority still behind, as a *corps de reserve*; but from whence it comes, or where it is to be found;—he is greatly nonplused to tell. According to his first letter, it was in the Confession of Faith; but is *now* in a head of public general fasting,—a head that has no existence in the book to which he referred!

That Loyalist, however, should be at a loss to distinguish between a Confession of Faith, and a Directory for Public Worship, needs not seem any thing strange. Far be it from us to discredit him with the supposition, that such *antiquated* things are familiar to him. May there not be some latent reason, for his treating them with scornful neglect? Concerning the *lucrative* art of obtaining

taining *underscriptions* on a Carte Blanche, the one *confesses* to give no instruction; nor does the other *direct* to such conduct, as once procured *expulsion* with ignominy from M—'s Ch—l.

And with regard to Loyalist's *present* mental caterer; he is to be considered as, perhaps better acquainted with *articles* than chapters which treat of faith. It lies more in his way to *assist* in reading the *dull* formulary of prayers, litanies, and collects, with epistles, gospels—for epistles, and for gospels even from the prophets and Apocalypse: all bearing evident signatures of their *extraction* from the *Antichristian Breviary* and *Mass-book*! And who but such as have "narrow and confined ideas," would not with enravishment caress the amiable *daughter* of the Lady superbly grand; arrayed in purple and scarlet-colour,—and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls,—full of names of *blasphemy*; and on whose forehead is written, in legible characters, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS, AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH?

The authority which Loyalist cites, wherever it be, is in these words: "Beside solemn and general fasts enjoined by *authority*; we judge, at other times, congregations may keep days of fasting; as divine providence shall administer unto them special occasions." "The authority here meant, (says he) *must* surely be that of civil, because it clearly appears to be different authority from that (*viz.* ecclesiastical) which is to appoint a congregational fast." Convictive reasoning! Who can withstand its force? Who can deny that the authority of a session is different from that of either presbytery, synod or general assembly. Important discovery! What cannot minds stored with liberal and enlarged ideas develop? A presbytery, synod, or general assembly, are not a session, that is, a session is just a session! Nevertheless for enabling to perceive how the authority of any of these courts, because not a session, *must* surely be different (in nature and kind) from that which is ecclesiastical; the assistance of something, very different from a *Sommerfian lens*, is indispensable requisite. Loyalist with equal

equal propriety might have argued, that because the *diacanian* authority, over the special concerns of the incorporation of *masons*, is of a *civil* nature; therefore the authority of the *magistrates* over Edinburgh, of the *sheriff* over Mid-Lothian, and the *lords of counsel and session* over the kingdom,—is of a nature *ecclesiastic*!!!

These are *all* the authorities which Loyalist has seen meet to exhibit as *conclusive* in favour of his opinion that Antiburghers *ought* to keep royal fasts; and how far they are so, is left, without any anxiety for the issue, to the reader's determination. He wantonly began the attack; and, by the manner in which he has conducted it,—has shown how unequal he was to the service. Whenever he shall manifest that his inculcating the observation of royal fasts (as above stated by the associate presbytery) is only an injoining of obedience to the *lawful* commands of a rightful sovereign, the Antiburghers will heartily return him their thanks,—and be all compliance: But if he stops *short* of this, and proceeds according to his present *eccentric* method; Antiburghers openly profess, however disgraceful he may reckon it,—that they are so narrow and confined in their ideas as to be unshaken by such *anarchy* of thought.

UBIVIS,
April 10. 1778. }



F I N I S.